



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

clg

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,587	12/04/2001	Michael A. Tainsky	0788.00063	5172

48924 7590 08/09/2006
KOHN & ASSOCIATES PLLC
30500 NORTHWESTERN HWY
STE 410
FARMINGTON HILLS, MI 48334

EXAMINER

CLOW, LORI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, filed 25 May 2006, has been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are currently pending. Claim 9 is cancelled. Claims 1-6 and 10-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 26 April 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7, as amended, recites "identifying the epitope bearing clones that are specific to the disease stage by classifying the epitope bearing clones based upon reactivity with serum antibodies to determine the markers to be included in the array based upon antibody reactivity values of the clones". It is unclear what applicant intends by "based upon reactivity". What about the reactivity determines markers to be included? Is this a separate determination from the

Art Unit: 1631

reactivity values? If the values determine the markers, what about the values would determine a marker? Clarification is requested. Claim 8 is rejected as being dependent from claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 7 and 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sioud et al., for the reasons recited in the previous Office Action.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that there is “no disclosure assay currently available that will screen or create an array of markers that are accurate in diagnosing and staging cancer or other forms of disease. In other words, while the Sioud et al. reference discloses biopanning methods that can determine the presence of a single marker, there is no disclosure for a method or assay that will screen for an unlimited number of markers within sera”.

This is not persuasive. Firstly, the claims are not limited to “screening or creating” an array of markers. The claims are limited to detecting an array or identifying an array. Secondly, the claims are not limited to an “accurate diagnosis or staging of cancer or other forms of disease”. Thirdly, Sioud et al. do not only disclose the presence of a single marker. Rather, Sioud et al. disclose biopanning breast cancer cell lines and identifying several positive clones.

Art Unit: 1631

Several antigens were selected, including p53, pentraxin, integrin and others (see section 2.3, page 718). Furthermore, phage-encoded cDNA products were purified and tested by ELISA. The tested clones, for the most part, showed only reactivity with patient sera (section 2.3, page 719). Testing by ELISA is done on a 96-well plate, which is broadly and reasonably interpreted to be an array. Lastly, the claims are not limited to screening an unlimited number of markers within sera. The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

Conclusion

The outstanding rejection over claim 8 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph has been withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claim.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1631

Inquiries

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central Fax Center Number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0715. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on (571) 272-0811.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

August 7, 2006
Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.
Art Unit 1631
Lori A. Clow

MARJORIE A. MORAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marjorie A. Moran